# SUPREME COURT MINUTES THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 2001 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

The Supreme Court of California reconvened in the courtroom of the Earl Warren Building, 350 McAllister Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California, on January 4, 2001, at 9:00 a.m.

Present: Chief Justice Ronald M. George, presiding, and Associate Justices Mosk, Kennard, Baxter, Werdegar, Chin, and Brown.

Officers present: Frederick K. Ohlrich, Clerk; and Harry Kinney, Supreme Court Marshal.

S086696 Bruce Sweatman III, Appellant

v.

Department of Veterans Affairs, Respondent

Cause called. D. Scott Mohney argued for Appellant.

Arnulfo Hernandez, Jr., Chief Counsel Department of Veterans Affairs, argued for Respondent.

Mr. Mohney replied.

Cause submitted.

S075263 People, Respondent

v.

Floyd E. Murphy, Jr., Appellant

Cause called. Donald I. Segerstrom, Jr., argued for Appellant. Rachelle A. Newcomb, Deputy Attorney General, argued for Respondent.

Mr. Segerstrom replied.

Cause submitted.

S080112 Ventura Group Ventures, Inc., Plaintiff and Appellant

v.

Ventura Board of Supervisors et al., Respondents and Appellants Cause called. John R. Johnson argued for Plaintiff and Appellant.

Thomas S. Bunn III opened argument for Respondent and Appellant Ventura Port District.

Timothy A. Bittle, appearing for Amicus Curiae Howard Jarvis Taxpayers, continued argument for Respondent and Appellant Ventura Port District.

Roberto R. Orellana, Assistant County Counsel Ventura County argued for Respondent and Appellant Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Johnson replied.

Cause submitted.

Court recessed upon 1:30 p.m. this date.

Court reconvened pursuant to recess.

Members of the Court and Officers present as first shown.

Officers present: Ken Wagovich, Deputy Clerk and Harry Kinney, Supreme Court Marshall.

S082662 People, Plaintiff and Respondent

v.

Robert Nelson Atkins, Defendant and Appellant

Cause called. Kelly E. LeBel, Deputy Attorney General, argued for Respondent.

Victor Blumenkrantz argued for Appellant.

Ms. LeBel replied.

Cause submitted.

S071080 Thomas M. Thompson, Respondent

v.

Department of Corrections et al., Appellants

Cause called. Susan Duncan Lee, Deputy Attorney General, argued for Appellants.

Jordan Eth, retained attorney, argued for Respondent.

Ms. Lee replied.

Cause submitted.

Court adjourned.

S071945 Charles J. Vacanti, M.D., Inc. et al., Plaintiffs and Appellants,

v.

State Compensation Insurance Fund et al.,

Defendants and Respondents.

We affirm in part and reverse in part the judgment of the Court of Appeal and remand for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

Brown, J.

We Concur:

George, C.J.

Mosk, J.

Kennard, J.

Baxter, J.

Chin, J.

Concurring Opinion by Werdegar, J.

S081661 The People, Plaintiff and Respondent

v.

Mary Lucia Mazurette, Defendant and Appellant.

The decision of the Court of Appeal dismissing defendant's appeal is affirmed.

Werdegar, J.

We Concur:

George, C.J.

Mosk, J.

Kennard, J.

Baxter, J.

Chin, J.

Brown, J.

2nd Dist. People, Respondent

B139839

v.

Div. 2 Loyal L. Outten, Appellant

The time for granting review on the court's own motion is hereby extended to and including January 18, 2001. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 28(a)(1).)

S012945 People, Respondent

v.

Stanley Bernard Davis, Appellant

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's brief is extended to and including February 28, 2001.

S023835 People, Respondent

v

Jesse Morrison, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including May 1, 2001.

### S024645 People, Respondent

v.

Omar Dent, III, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including March 5, 2001.

No further extensions of time are contemplated.

#### S025748 People, Respondent

V.

Jose Lupercio Casares, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opposition to respondent's motion to restrict juror contact is extended to and including January 19, 2001.

No further extensions of time are contemplated.

#### S027730 People, Respondent

V.

Maria Del Rosio Alfaro, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's reply brief is extended to and including January 29, 2001.

### S030644 People, Respondent

v.

Ricardo Roldan, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including March 6, 2001.

#### S032146 People, Respondent

v.

Joseph Danks, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including March 9, 2001.

#### S041630 People, Respondent

v.

Phillip Carl Jablonski, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the appellant is granted to and including March 5, 2001, to request correction of the record on appeal. Counsel for appellant is ordered to notify the Clerk of the Supreme Court in writing as soon as the act as to which the Court has granted an extension of time has been completed.

#### S049743 People, Respondent

v.

Caroline Young, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the appellant is granted to and including March 6, 2001, to request correction of the record on appeal. Counsel for appellant is ordered to notify the Clerk of the Supreme Court in writing as soon as the act as to which the Court has granted an extension of time has been completed.

No further extensions of time will be granted.

## S055415 People, Respondent

v.

Robert Wesley Cowan, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the appellant is granted to and including March 6, 2001, to request correction of the record on appeal. Counsel for appellant is ordered to notify the Clerk of the Supreme Court in writing as soon as the act as to which the Court has granted an extension of time has been completed.

## S057321 People, Respondent

v.

Darrell Lee Lomax, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the appellant is granted to and including February 27, 2001, to request correction of the record on appeal. Counsel for appellant is ordered to notify the Clerk of the Supreme Court in writing as soon as the act as to which the Court has granted an extension of time has been completed.

#### S067491 In re Ronald Harold Seaton

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file petitioner's reply to informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including January 30, 2001.

No further extensions of time are contemplated.

#### S073709 In re Ward Francis Weaver, Jr.

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including February 26, 2001.

No further extensions of time will be granted.

## S080669 In re Darnell Lucky

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including January 29, 2001.

#### S084903 In re Mark Alan Bradford

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file petitioner's reply to informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including February 26, 2001.

#### S086738 Theresa Aguilar et al., Appellants

V.

Atlantic Richfield Corporation et al., Appellants

On application of the parties and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the responses to amicus curiae briefs is extended to and including February 2, 2001.

### S088458 Lockheed Martin Corporation et al., Petitioners

v.

San Bernardino County Superior Court, Respondent

Roslyn Carrillo et al., Real Parties in Interest

On application of amici curiae State Farm General Insurance and United States Automobile Assn. and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the amicus curiae brief herein is extended to and including January 29, 2001.

No further extensions will be granted.

#### S090699 Alex Montenegro, Respondent

v.

Deborah Diaz, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's answer brief on the merits is extended to and including January 16, 2001.

## S090886 People, Respondent

V.

Anthony Clifford Sousa, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief on the merits is extended to and including February 5, 2001.

### S091297 Harvey Greenfield, Appellant

v.

Fritz Companies, Inc., et al., Respondents

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's answer brief on the merits is extended to and including February 2, 2001.

## S092697 John Hess, Appellant

v.

Ford Motor Company, Defendant and Appellant

On application of defendant and appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file defendant and appellant's opening brief on the merits is extended to and including February 26, 2001.

S093234 Michael G., a minor

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file petitioner's reply to the informal response is extended to and including January 5, 2001.

Bar Misc. 4186 In the Matter of the Application of the Committee of Bar Examiners of the State of California for Admission of Attorneys

The written motion of the Committee of Bar Examiners that the following named applicants, who have fulfilled the requirements for admission to practice law in the State of California, be admitted to the practice of law in this state is hereby granted, with permission to the applicants to take the oath before a competent officer at another time and place:

(LIST OF NAMES ATTACHED TO ORIGINAL ORDER)

## S073473 In re **Howard C. Knadler** on Discipline

Good cause having been shown, it is hereby ordered that probation is revoked, the previously ordered stay of execution of suspension in the above-entitled matter is lifted, and **Howard C.** Knadler, State Bar No. 85063, shall be actually suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of respondent's rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. Credit toward the period of actual suspension shall be given for the period of involuntary inactive enrollment which commenced on October 15, 2000 (Business & Professions Code section 6007(d)(3)). He is also ordered to attend State Bar Ethics School during the period of his actual suspension and take and pass the test given at the end of such session. Respondent is further ordered to comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective .\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

## S076839 In re **Creig A. Dolge** on Discipline

Good cause having been shown, it is hereby ordered that probation is revoked, the previously ordered stay of execution of suspension in the above-entitled matter is lifted, and Creig A. Dolge, **State Bar No. 101651,** shall be suspended from the practice of law for 34 months and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for five years on condition that he be actually suspended for 60 days. He is ordered to comply with the conditions of probation previously imposed in S076839 (96-O-06912), as recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed October 25, 2000. The period of actual suspension shall be consecutive to the actual suspension previously imposed in S076839 (96-O-06912). Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-third of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2002, 2003 and 2004. (Business & Professions Code 6086.10.)

## S092338 In re **Sheldon M. Kaufman** on Discipline

It is ordered that Sheldon M. Kaufman, State Bar No. 30532, be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he provides proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years subject to the conditions of probation, including 45 days actual suspension, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation executed July 18, 2000. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See Segretti v. State Bar (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2001, 2002 and 2003.

### S092342 In re **Alma Rosa Bonilla** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Alma Rosa Bonilla, State Bar No. 186253,** be suspended from the practice of law for nine months, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that she be placed on probation for 18 months on condition that she be actually suspended for 30 days. She is also ordered to comply with the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation executed on August 31, 2000, as modified by its order filed October 6, 2000. It is further ordered that she take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti* v. *State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2002 and 2003. (Bus. & Prof. Code section 6086.10.)

#### S092343 In re **Humberto Samuel Hernandez** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Humberto Samuel Hernandez**, **State Bar No. 183659**, be suspended from the practice of law for six months, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended for 30 days. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation executed on April 31, 2000. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti* v. *State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2001, 2002 and 2003.

### S092360 In re **Ernesto Obillo Caunan** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Ernesto Obillo Caunan, State Bar No. 174518,** be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended for 30 days. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation executed on

August 22, 2000. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti* v. *State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2001 and 2002.

## S092362 In re **John William Bernbrock** on Discipline

It is ordered that John William Bernbrock. State Bar No. 144254, be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he provides proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years subject to the conditions of probation, including one year actual suspension and restitution, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation executed July 18, 2000. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See Segretti v. State Bar (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2001, 2002 and 2003.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

# S092381 In re **Michael B. Lloyd** on Discipline

It is hereby ordered that **Michael B. Lloyd, State Bar No. 71708,** be disbarred from the practice of law and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. Respondent is also ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

## S092432 In re **Larry H. Kreueger** on Discipline

It is ordered that Larry H. Kreueger, State Bar No. 46885, be suspended from the practice of law for two years, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be actually suspended for one year as recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision filed September 7, 2000; and until the State Bar Court grants a motion to terminate his actual suspension pursuant to rule 205 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the conditions of probation, if any, hereinafter imposed by the State Bar Court as a condition for terminating his actual suspension. If respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he shall remain actually suspended until he provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. It is further ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See Segretti v. State Bar (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that respondent perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S093836 In the Matter of the Resignation of **John Gerard Hedderman**A Member of the State Bar of California

The voluntary resignation of **John Gerard Hedderman**, **State Bar No. 134109**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against respondent should he hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 60 and 70 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S093837 In the Matter of the Resignation of **Louis Steven Sanchez**A Member of the State Bar of California

The voluntary resignation of **Louis Steven Sanchez**, **State Bar No. 82775**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against respondent should he hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 60 and 70 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)